REMARKS

Claim 12 was objected to because of informalities. Claim 6 and 8 to 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by US 5,245,155 (Pratt et al.) or US 2004/0191064 (Guo), in view of US 2,288,433 (Boettcher et al) or US 2,662,277 (Stone). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pratt et al. or Guo, in view of Boetcher et al. or Stone as applied to claim 6, and further in view of US 4,224,499 (Jones) or US 2004/0169022 (Mega). Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pratt or Guo in view of Boetcher or Stone as applied to claim 6, and further in view of US 2,492,833 (Baumann) or US 2,200,287 (Lysholm). Claims 10 and 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pratt et al. or Guo in view of Boetcher or Stone as applied to claim 6, and further in view of Baumann or Lysholm.

Claim 6 has been amended, and the claims now properly numbered.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Objections to claim "12" because of Informalities

Claim 12 was objected to because of informalities.

As requested by the Examiner, Applicants have renumbered claim 12 as filed on September 3, 2009 to claim 11.

Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claim 6 and 8 to 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 6 has been amended to provide proper antecedent basis.

Withdrawal of the rejections to claims 6 and 8 to 11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second

paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by US 5,245,155 (Pratt et al.) or US 2004/0191064 (Guo), in view of US 2,288,433 (Boettcher et al) or US 2,662,277 (Stone).

Claim 6 (currently amended): A method for joining at least two gas turbine components under dynamic load comprising:

aligning the at least two gas turbine components relative to one another in an aligned position;

joining the at least two gas turbine components together in the aligned position by an auxiliary weld; and

welding the at least two gas turbine components using laser powder build-up welding to form a separate weld to join said at least two gas turbine components together.

With respect to Guo, Guo already has a Z-notch interlock [See 0026] to join the blades. There is absolutely no reason or motivation to provide a further connection. Morever, the wled repair is not for the purpose of joining the two components togtther, but rather to resurface the components. See [0026].

Furthermore, the purported aligning in Guo includes interlocking. If interlocking provides the connection, why is an extra weld needed? Even given the teachings of Boetcher and Stone there is no reason for two welds in the surfacing repair method of Guo.

With respect to Pratt, Pratt uses a separate device for aligning and it is respectfully submitted that there is absolutely no reason to use a separate weld. The Office Action standard at page 6, that "Pratt does not teach away any additional means..." is not the proper standard. The proper standard is, would one of skill in the art, reviewing the prior art, have found it obvious to modify Pratt to provide an extra weld. It is respectfully submitted, that Pratt only wants or desires one weld, and needs no aligning weld, as such a weld would be superfluous to the aligning device. There is simply no reason or motivation to remove or alter the aligning device in Pratt, and one of skill in the art, it is respectfully submitted, would not have done so in view of

either Boetcher or Stone.

Withdrawal of the rejections to claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) thus is respectfully requested.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pratt et al. or Guo, inview of Boetcher et al. or Stone as applied to claim 6, and further in view of US 4,224,499 (Jones) or US 2004/0169022 (Mega).

In view of the above, withdrawal of the rejections to claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) thus is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pratt or Guo in view of Boetcher or Stone as applied to claim 6, and further in view of US 2,492,833 (Baumann) or US 2,200,287 (Lysholm).

With further respect to claim 9, it is respectfully submitted that it would not have been obvious to modify either Pratt nor Guo, as Pratt has an aligning device which does not appear suitable for such flanges and Guo is concerned with a repair method only, which is not applicable to such flanges.

Withdrawal of the rejections to claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) thus is respectfully requested.

Claims 10 and 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pratt et al. or Guo in view of Boetcher or Stone as applied to claim 6, and further in view of Baumann or Lysholm.

With further respect to claim 10, it is respectfully submitted that it would not have been obvious to modify either Pratt nor Guo, as Pratt has an aligning device which does not appear suitable for such flanges and Guo is concerned with a repair method only, which is not applicable to such flanges.

Withdrawal of the rejections to claim 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) thus is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and Applicants respectfully request such action. If any additional fees are deemed to be due at this time, the Assistant Commissioner is authorized to charge payment of the same to Deposit Account No. 50-0552.

Respectfully submitted,
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: _____
William C. Gehris, Reg. No. 38,156

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue, 14th Floor
New York, NY 10018
(212) 736-1940